

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 15, 17-22, 24, 26-27, 29, 36-39, 41-48 and 59-60 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18, 24, 26, 27, 41, 59 and 60 have been amended. Claims 2, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 23, 25, 28, 29, 42, and 49-58 have been canceled. Claims 30-35 were previously withdrawn.

Applicants previously filed a Notice of Appeal and requested a Pre-Appeal - Brief Conference. As a result of that Conference, the previous rejection has been withdrawn, and a new Office Action issued. Additionally, in spite of an agreement between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner that the finality of the office action would be withdrawn, the Examiner notes in paragraph 1 that upon her further consideration the finality will stand. Accordingly, an RCE accompanies this Amendment.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 15-17, and 59-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mannings et al. (Mannings).

Claim 1 as amended recites:

A method for obtaining location data in a mobile telecommunications network, the network including a plurality of mobile units and a plurality of base units, the method comprising:

- initiating an application using a data channel of the mobile telecommunications network;
- receiving audible input spoken by a user over a voice channel of the mobile telecommunications network;
- automatically determining location information by geocoding the received audible input; and
- providing the location information to the application.

As described in claim 1, an application is initiated using a data channel of a mobile telecommunications network. A user speaks audible input over a voice channel, and the user's spoken input is then automatically geocoded to determine

location information. The geocoded location information is then provided to the application.

Mannings does not anticipate claim 1. Mannings discloses a navigation information system for generating guidance information for mobile units. A mobile unit, such as an in-car navigation device, communicates with a server using dual-tone multi-frequency (DTMF) signals.

In Mannings, a user provides information either by using the telephone keypad to send DTMF signals, or by speaking with a human operator (see, e.g., col. 8, lines 28-39). There is no teaching in Mannings of receiving spoken audible input from a user, and automatically geocoding the input to obtain location information. At best, Mannings discloses a manual process by which an operator obtains destination information from a user and then manually programs destination information remotely into the vehicle interface.

Accordingly, Mannings does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the claimed steps of “receiving audible input spoken by a user over a voice channel of the mobile telecommunications network” and “automatically determining location information by geocoding the received audible input”. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Mannings, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Independent claims 15, 59 and 60 are similarly patentable over Mannings and the rejection of those claims should also be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-7, 9, 11, 17-22, 24, 26-27, 36-39, 41, 43 and 44-48 depend from claims 1, and 15 and thus derive patentability both from their dependence from those claims as well as from reciting their own patentable features. The rejection of those claims should therefore be withdrawn.

If any matters remain outstanding prior to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (415) 875-2358 or via e-mail at dbrownstone@fenwick.com. Applicants acknowledge that a copy of any electronic mail communications will be made of record in the application file per MPEP § 502.03.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Allen Stouffer *et al*

Date: 5 July 2007

By: Daniel R. Brownstone 46,581/
Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No. 46,581
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel: (415) 875-2358/Fax: (415) 281-1350
dbrownstone@fenwick.com